



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

an error, is very widely extended. Those who think thus declare that war cannot be eradicated by human will. I have heard it remarked that Christian men and women are prone to this belief that everything must remain as it is; and for that reason we find so few Christian men among the champions of the peace movement. The leaders are rather scientists, poets, etc. At least, that is the case in Europe.

Still we do not find a large number of men ready to take a leading part in this movement. It is not a matter of sentiment; it is a matter of scientific knowledge. Only those who believe in the progress of the world, the evolution of human society, will give themselves to such a movement as ours. When they become imbued with these convictions women will join the peace movement, and do so effectively. As long as the error remains that war is a necessity, women will not join. On the contrary, they will continue to countenance war. They will stifle their maternal feelings and try to enkindle in their husbands the warlike spirit. In the hour of national conflict they will give moral encouragement. They will even give their personal assistance, and consider themselves heroines for doing so. There is a statue erected in the Public Square of an Austrian town to a young peasant girl who, ninety years ago, when the French were storming the city, hurled down some dozen Frenchmen by stabbing them with a fork.

We are of those who consider that war is not necessary; then, not being so, that it is a crime. We consider murder a sin, and we consider war as wholesale murder, although making allowance for the great error that is in the mind of the murderer. We do not condemn as murderers the soldiers who do what they are taught.

But now, speaking to women who, by study or by intuition, do not know that war is a relic of barbarism, and that men by their misguided judgment will make it continue, I want to speak to the women about their responsibility and their duty. In the contention against war women have some chance. In some spheres we have great influence and power, and if we fail to use this influence and this power in the service of what we consider the most glorious cause in the world, we commit a great sin of omission. As mothers, we have the power to lead the next generation to peace, not only by banishing out of the nursery the tin soldier and out of the schoolroom the bloody stories of warfare, but by lifting the minds of our growing sons to the realization that we live in a time where a higher and nobler civilization is being wrought out, and that theirs will be the opportunity to hasten the realization of this idea.

Now, mothers, sisters, you have another advantage over men. It is this: While a certain roughness and hardness is excusable, perhaps even desirable, in the composition of a strong man's character, the chief virtues of woman are declared to be gentleness, kind-heartedness, charity and pity. It is our privilege to show these feelings without restraint and to make them the mainspring of our actions. Let us use this privilege in the struggle against warfare. War, being the cause of the vastest sufferings, it is also the occasion of the vastest pity. Only read the reports from Port Arthur. Try to realize the depths of these horrors and your hearts must melt. While such wars are being waged, while such misery and such cruelty are staining our earthly home, every woman

should be clad in deep mourning; no woman should be seen to smile. Only imagine that nine days' battle, where fifty thousand bodies covered the ground, and where the wounded had been lying nine days without help! Only think of the men and the horses caught in the tangled wires and hanging there, as an eye witness described it, hanging there like rats caught in a trap! Think of the whole regiment blown into the air by an exploding mine,—again I quote my eye witness,—the sky darkened by the falling limbs! Imagine the heaps of twenty thousand bodies under the walls of Port Arthur, those bodies covered with chalk that they may not pollute the air! Are you sure, quite sure, that they were all corpses? In some of those miserable and wretched creatures the vestiges of life still remained.

If you read and think of those things, if you try to realize them, hatred against war must inflame your hearts and pity must pervade your souls. Fortunately human imagination is not strong enough to realize all these horrors. We can only grasp what is seen. If we could but grasp all those things I think it would make us mad. And our great pity must not be allowed to weaken our reason; it must be our strength. We can never undo what has been done, and we cannot stop what is going on, but what we can do is to help to prepare a new order in which these things will never occur again. And as we can do it, so let us do it.

How Shall We Get Rid of the Great Armaments?

Address of Rev. Charles E. Jefferson at the Boston Peace Congress, Thursday Evening, October 5.

Ladies and Gentlemen: In the words of an ancient Hebrew writer, "There be three things that are too wonderful for me." There are even four that I know not, and those things, I think, are more perplexing and more baffling than those which perplexed and discomforted the ancient Hebrew. The first thing is that in the year of our Lord 1904 the nations of the earth should be walking around, like Hamlet's father, armed from top to toe, and all ready to fight at the drop of a hat. We expect that sort of thing in the earlier stages of development, when men are raw and have not mastered the first principles of living. We are not surprised when we find it in cannibal islands, or far-off wildernesses where men run wild like dogs and wolves. We are not surprised when we find it in the back woods of Kentucky or the remotest mining camp. But that in the most civilized parts of the globe, where education has done her best work, where cultivation has reached its highest pitch, and where the hearts of men have grown gentle and human hands have learned the divine art of helping—that there the leading nations should be weighted down with weapons, not with weapons formed after the fashion of polite society, but with weapons slung over the shoulder, strapped on the back, dangling from the hips, just as if they were so many cut-throats or outlaws or bar-room thugs, ready to fly at one another's throats,—that is one thing that to me is wonderful.

And this is the second thing that is wonderful: The weight of the armaments seems to be proportioned to the national profession of allegiance to Jesus Christ. It

is the Christian nations that are the most heavily armed. It is where the Bible has been taught the longest and where it is the most generally read and accepted that the guns are the largest and that the swords have been whetted to the finest edge. The nations that have built the cross into their architecture, woven it into the fabric of their civilization, have brought forth as the consummate flower of their civilization the torpedo boat and the torpedo boat destroyer. The nations that have placed the crown on the head of the Prince of Peace, and most loudly proclaimed him the Lord of all, are the nations that are the most proficient in multiplying the instruments of destruction. That the Christian nations should permit Mauser rifles and gatling guns, lyddite shells, twelve-inch projectiles and floating mines around the cross of the Son of God, with his great words vibrating in the ear, "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword,"—that to me is wonderful.

And this is the third wonderful thing: With the weight of the armies increasing year by year, the war budgets are going up in the countries of Europe, and in our country too. It was only about twenty-five years ago that Von Moltke said that all Europe was groaning under the weight of an armed peace. But the weight then was as nothing compared with the weight to-day. The old nations are staggering, threatened with national bankruptcy, and the great world powers struggling under the unbearable weight, cry out, "Who shall deliver us from the body of this death?" But all the time the terrible weight increases and grows heavier and heavier, and the wise men nod with approval and benediction. That to me is wonderful.

But the most wonderful thing of all is that nobody wants to fight, nobody wants to use the armaments, all the world's rulers are men of peace; they use the phraseology of the peace makers; all the world's statesmen are men of peace,—they always say that when they ask for appropriations. The merchants the world over abhor war because they know it means havoc to commerce, and throws the trade of the world into chaos. The wage-earning masses, as we have been told to-night, are more and more coming to spurn and despise war because they know that when it comes they will furnish the food for the bullets, and that upon their shoulders will ultimately fall the burdens which it creates. The military chieftains and the great generals—they too are men of peace, and they very frankly tell us that war is barbarism, is savagery, is hell.

Yet, strange to say, it seems to be because we are so desperately and passionately in favor of peace that the armaments keep right on growing. We are building up our armies and navies in order to keep the peace. It has become a maxim in many circles that the surest guarantee of peace is preparedness for war. A United States senator not long ago declared that upon the efficacy of our national armament depends the peace of our nation. That is what the rulers are saying the wide world over.

Isn't it singular that we have got into all this expense because we are determined to preserve the peace? Isn't it singular that it should become axiomatic that the only possible way to keep from fighting is to gird yourself for battle, the only way to preserve a peaceful disposition is to keep your eyes fixed on slaughter, the only way to

cultivate kindly sentiments in others is to make yourself look as ferocious as you can; and that if you are in dead earnest in the work of saving men, you must just give your days and nights to making yourselves expert in the art of shedding blood? That to me is the most wonderful thing of all.

In hours of bewilderment and despondency, I think one is tempted to repeat with Mark Antony, "Oh judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason!" But in our sensible hours we know that that is not true. Judgment has not fled to brutish beasts and men have not lost their reason. The world seems to be mad at times, but there is method sometimes in its madness. It is too involved in the idea that a nation must, first of all, defend itself against possible encroachment, against possible wrongs, and that so long as one nation arms itself to the teeth, all the other nations must arm themselves too. That, I think, accounts for the whole terrible tragedy, and that is why it is that this subject of the reduction of armaments is the most difficult phase of all the peace problem.

There are many men earnest advocates of peace who believe in great navies and great armies. There are many men who believe in arbitration, who talk for it and work for it, who do not want to reduce the military armaments. When twenty-six nations sent their representatives to the Hague Conference, the representatives discussed a variety of steps and introduced enormous reforms, but they did not dare to touch the reduction of armaments so much as with the tip of their finger. Arguments seem to effect so little in this phase of the problem. You can say it is too foolish, and it is. You can say it is wicked, and you can bear down hard on the word "wicked." You can say it is diabolical to spend this money and waste the national resources and take the bread out of the mouths of the children and break the back of the peasant and block the progress of the education, of the philanthropy and the religious work of the world.

All that is true. You may say it is wicked and dangerous and fills the world with suppositions and rumors of war, and puts everybody in the position of a man trying to go to sleep on the slope of Vesuvius. But, somehow or other, all these arguments do not seem to carry weight. Nothing, or almost nothing, has been said in the United States Congress or the Reichstag or in the British Parliament or the French Chamber of Deputies towards carrying out reduction of armaments. It is foolish to spend six or seven million dollars on a battleship that is likely to be antiquated before it is ever used. It is wicked for the United States to spend a hundred million dollars a year on its navy in times of peace when it has not an enemy in the world, when we need every dollar of the money in the care and lifting up of eight millions of black men into the light of God; wicked, I think, for any one to spend our hundreds of millions on our armies and navies with this great mass of ignorance festering in our great cities, constituting a darkness blacker than darkest Africa; wicked for countries to put such weight on the backs of their citizens as to drive thousands of them into anarchy and atheism and suicide.

Of course we know it is dangerous. Great armies and great navies are not a guarantee of peace. They are a standing menace to the peace of the world. Although

the Hague Court may be firmly established, just so long as the great drums keep beating and the great guns keep booming and every day the battleships are drawn up in battle line, just so long the blood of men will be feverish, and war, like a beast, will crouch at our door. Of course it is dangerous. Goliath never is so eager for a scrap as when he has his armor on. Never does he strut so insolently and never does he boast so loudly as when he feels the great sabre in his hand. You cannot fill the papers of a nation day after day, week after week, year after year, with pictures of battleships and torpedo boats and destroyers, bombs and projectiles and shells, without lowering the tone of the national mind and coarsening the feeling of the national heart, without strengthening the reign of the idolatry of military glory. You cannot pile up powder in heaps here and there throughout this world in which are so many men carrying matches, without inviting and making inevitable frequent and terrific explosions. But while we all admit that it is dangerous for the world to do it, it is not dangerous, people think, for one nation to do it. There is the rub. It is wicked, oh, so wicked, for all to do it, but not wicked for one. The wise men of the world have said, "No, it is not wicked, it is not foolish, for one nation to do it, for our neighbors are doing it all around." So we see now what we must do for the solidarity of the race. God has made all the nations of one blood. They feel there is greater military safety for all to keep together than for one of them to break away and do what it thinks is steadily right. Nations are not idealists. They all cling to the earth. The nations would rather walk four legs on the ground and keep together than to fly separately into the air.

Therefore we are dealing to-night with an international problem. No one nation can discuss it adequately. No one nation can settle it. America will never lay down her arms alone, I fear. Indeed, I know she will not, because America has not the faith to walk along that dim and perilous way unattended; nor will England or France or Germany or Italy or Russia. The nations must come together. There must be frequent conferences at The Hague. There must be frequent comings together of the friends of peace. There must be a federation of the nations. There must be a parliament of the world. What we want is atmosphere. We cannot pound off the armor. It must be melted off by an atmosphere made warm with goodwill. When we know each other better we shall not want to go armed. Brothers we are and have always been and will ever be, and every heart the wide world over, in its better hours, beats true to the music of the Golden Rule; for have n't we, after all, one Father and has not one God created us? You cannot break the armor, but it can be melted. The enginery of force will not be broken down by the rapid blows of logic, nor will it go down before the forces of philanthropy nor the developments of science, but it will be melted, it will dissolve, it will pass away under the rising tide of love, for it is as true now as when the Persian heard it: "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord."

The *Journal of Education* says that more steel is being used in making steel pens than in making swords and guns.

Proceedings of the Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress (Continued).

The President called the Congress to order at 10 o'clock Thursday morning, October 6, in Tremont Temple, and read a set of resolutions which he had received from the Twenty-third Massachusetts Regiment Association of Salem, Mass., strongly favoring arbitration and peace.

The Secretary presented further letters and telegrams of greeting.

The first order of business was a report from the Committee on Juridical Questions on treaties of arbitration, made by Joseph G. Alexander. The resolutions, which were given in full in our issue of November, expressed deep gratification at the signing within the year of ten treaties of obligatory arbitration, and the hope that the example might be followed by many more governments. They pointed out the unlimited treaty between Denmark and the Netherlands as a model for all future treaties, and expressed hearty appreciation of the action of President Roosevelt in taking steps to secure arbitration treaties with all governments willing to enter into them. The resolutions urged that hereafter arbitral clauses in treaties of commerce, etc., should provide for reference of disputes to the Hague Court.

Mr. Alexander summarized the valuable report of the Berne Peace Bureau on the progress made in the matter of arbitration treaties in the different countries during the past year. The report from Germany indicated that public opinion there was not very favorable to arbitration treaties. A treaty had, however, been signed with Great Britain, and that was most encouraging. The report from Denmark expressed just pride over the treaty with the Netherlands, a treaty without any reservations. From France, where public sentiment is most favorable, the report mentioned four arbitration treaties already signed; that from Great Britain three; and two more had been signed since the report was written. The Italian report declared that public opinion in that country was generally favorable to such treaties, though not enthusiastic. Treaties had been signed with Great Britain and France and arbitral clauses had already been placed in twenty-one treaties of commerce, etc. The answer from Norway stated that the government was in negotiation with ten other governments for treaties of arbitration, two of which, those with France and Great Britain, the speaker said, had been signed since the report was prepared. The report from the Netherlands showed a favorable state of public opinion. A treaty had been signed with Denmark, and a treaty of commerce with Portugal had provided that all disputes should be referred to arbitration. From Switzerland it was reported that the Federal Council had announced its intention to include arbitral clauses in all treaties. The report from the United States stated that the government, though it had not yet signed any arbitration treaties, had done much in many ways to promote arbitration, and that public sentiment in general was strongly in favor of the conclusion of treaties with other countries.

Mr. Alexander explained that the reason for the movement for the conclusion of those treaties of obligatory arbitration was because the Hague Conference, on account of the objection of some of the delegates, had